



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

and Christianity is equivalent to assuming that there can be no essential interrelation in particulars without practical identity between the two systems in their entirety. This may be true of "systems"; is it true of life? If not, popular Stoic philosophy, which had already leavened the life of the Graeco-Roman world before Christianity appeared upon the scene, may have contributed far more to the New Testament than Bonhöffer believes.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

SHIRLEY JACKSON CASE

Notes sur la fixation du latin classique. (Extrait des *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, Tome XVII, pp. 266-80, et Tome XVIII, pp. 146-62.) Par J. MAROUZEAU. Paris: Librairie Ancienne Honoré Champion, Editeur, 1911, 1913.

"Urban" Latin and "rustic" Latin must always have been in conflict in the Latin-speaking world, just as literary speech and uneducated speech are in all nations where the language has a literary norm. But the division should perhaps be drawn rather between the educated speakers of Latin, mostly knowing Greek almost or quite as well as their native tongue, reinforced by the poets and the grammarians, and, on the other side, those who formed the uneducated populace of Rome and of the country districts and the provinces. The influence of the educated classes would not, however, be confined to Rome; on the contrary, not only at Rome, but throughout the Roman domain, wherever there was a circle of educated speakers of Latin, correct ways of speech would leaven the language of the less educated.

It is the linguistic phenomena due to this conflict, down to about the time of Augustus, that M. Marouzeau portrays in this treatise. Literary speech, he says, preserved several diphthongs which in popular speech became monophthongs; it retained initial and intervocalic *h*, and inserted *h* to show the aspiration of Greek mutes, as also in some native Latin words, while *h* was lacking in such positions in popular speech; it was responsible for the spelling with *i* in *maximus*, as opposed to the *u* of older and popular speech; it restored to full value the weakened or lost final *s*; and there were certain differences in the use of suffixes in substantives.

While much of this will readily be granted, there are some matters to which exception may be taken. It may be doubted if this conflict played much of a part in the retention of *oe* which has not developed to *u* (*Poenus*, *Punicus*, etc.), except in special words; the *Sprachtempo*, which M. Marouzeau does not mention, is certainly a factor in the doublet *nil*, *nîl*; the genitives in Plaut. *Poen.* 838, *Merc.* 832, *Most.* 113 are decidedly not subjective (II, p. 6).

Despite, however, a certain amount of dissent in detail and the lack of anything startlingly new in this essay of M. Marouzeau, we are indebted to him for a satisfactory sketch of the results in the Latin language brought about by the conflict between the speech of the educated element and that of the uneducated masses—a difference which should constantly be borne in mind by those who interpret the Latin language and literature.

ROLAND G. KENT

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA